Theorising Gender, Sexuality and Settler Colonialism: An Introduction

SCOTT LAURIA MORGENSEN
Queen's University

'Hoke-tee', the cover image offered to this issue by Taskigi/Diné artist Hulleah J. Tsinhnahjinnie, presents a protean site for considering how our contributors advance theories of settler colonialism. Taken from the series *Portraits of Amnesia*, 'Hoke-tee' portrays juxtapositions that interrupt any narrative of the moon as *terra nullius*. Whose human existence becomes legible once the moon appears as a site traversed by humans: in body, but also in memory, or in history? We know *his* – a white heteropatriarchal national manhood achieved here by having mined rare earths, fabricated massive technologies, and invested in capital's projection to send him and his white brethren to this place. But what crosses the frame, unnoticed by a gaze he directs always forward, and elsewhere: a child, whose dress may be elevating, whose chair may be transporting a historical awareness and multi-generational presence long-defiant of his Manifest Destiny?

The child's interruption of 'empty land' reminds us that the ontology of settler colonialism has been premised on its own boundlessness: always capable of projecting another horizon over which it might establish and incorporate a newest frontier. Projecting onto the moon this fiction known as the United States is a specifically settler-colonial act; and not merely in its long-term vision, in which after taking the moon back in his suitcase, his kind intend to return here to be emplaced. For in doing so, this act ignores and thinks to erase that both he and the moon bear a relationship to this

child of her nations – a child, perhaps, with a potential to be any gender in her nations – and, as a youth, one through whom the people sustain a future relationship to this land, regardless of whether he notices. In its break from the settler-colonial narrative, the image invites irruptive possibilities for imagining alternative viewpoints and passages through time and space that centre a critical awareness among those whom settlers attempted to eliminate. Yet, Tsinhnahjinnie tells us, against amnesia: the people survive, and do not forget.

This collection extends the effort of *settler colonial studies* to explain the specificities of settler colonialism by centering analysis of gender and sexuality. The insight that colonialism is produced, extended, and illuminated by gendered and sexual power is a hallmark of colonial studies, but that body of scholarship has left the power of settler colonialism under-theorised and in need of distinctive accounts. Gender and sexuality are intrinsic to the colonisation of indigenous peoples and the promulgation of European modernity by settlers, whether in pursuit of what Patrick Wolfe has theorised as a logic of indigenous 'elimination', or of what Lorenzo Veracini, Philip Deloria, and scholars in indigenous studies have examined as the indigenisation of settlers. Theories of settler colonisation will remain incomplete if they do not investigate how this political and economic formation is constituted by gendered and sexual power.

Addressing this demand, contributors to this collection critically and creatively engage knowledges generated among colonised indigenous peoples who resist settler rule. In doing so they displace the epistemic frame of settlers and enhance theory of the relationality of indigenous and settler subjects in colonial situations. Contributors argue that to centre the knowledges of the colonised does not posit that the colonised think uniformly or never become complicit with or co-responsible in colonial rule. Indeed, if we understand heteropatriarchy on stolen land to be a settler-colonial project, then arenas for conforming to settler rule will extend beyond those typically marked by anti-colonialism and will foreground gendered and sexual spaces. Nevertheless, the contributors share an intention to enhance indigenous peoples' capacity for liberation by opening the societies established by 'invaders/settlers' (in Brendan

Hokowhitu's formulation) to radical change. This intention is enhanced by the collection's array of cases theorising Palestinians under Israeli occupation alongside Māori in New Zealand, and Creek, Ho-Chunk, and many more indigenous nations and alliances in the United States and Canada. The essays advance knowledge of settler colonialism and indigenous resistance by examining these disparate national contexts nearby, or at times through explicit comparison. Settler colonial studies, indigenous studies, Palestinian, Arab, and Middle East studies, and all related fields can learn how settler colonialisms may be theorised comparatively and interdependently, and how gender and sexuality immediately inform efforts to comprehend and challenge settler-colonial power.

THEORISING GENDER, SEXUALITY, AND SETTLER COLONIALISM

Indigenous feminist and LGBTQ/Two-Spirit criticisms have established the ineluctably gendered and sexual quality of settlers' attempted conquest of indigenous peoples. This literature teaches that heteropatriarchal colonialism has sexualised indigenous lands and peoples as violable, subjugated indigenous kin ties as perverse, attacked familial ties and traditional gender roles, and all to transform indigenous peoples for assimilation within or excision from the political and economic structures of white settler societies.[1] Although these lessons are recorded in scholarly texts, the violences they name have been challenged by indigenous women and LGBTQ/Two-Spirit people who organise for their own and their people's liberations. Among many examples, the Aboriginal women's movement in Canada, Two-Spirit organising across North America, and *takatapui* organising in Aotearoa New Zealand offer grounded theories of gendered and sexual colonisation and of indigenous resistance.[2] Crucially, such movements do not restrict their address to persons so-identified, for they argue that colonial heteropatriarchy structures the lives of all indigenous persons, and that divesting from it will be necessary to collective work for decolonisation.

Activist and intellectual legacies such as these make possible this collection and its investigations of gender, sexuality, and settler colonialism, and recur continually in our accounts. 'Calling', *Karangatia*, invokes the opening of an exchange of words in which

many will listen and may eventually speak, but within a context first defined by indigenous women who call a diversity of gendered and sexual subjects into conversation. This title, by Michelle Erai's suggestion, positions both the issue's contents and our collaboration as co-editors. Whereas I write this introduction as sole author, I do so to present my response as a white settler critic to a context of speaking, listening, learning, and acting that has been defined by the calls of indigenous feminist and LGBTQ/Two-Spirit scholars and activists.

With these histories in mind, this introduction and our collection theorise gender, sexuality, and settler colonialism by advancing beyond similar scholarship in colonial studies. For some time now, the very ubiquity of feminist and queer accounts in colonial studies has appeared to explain gender and sexuality in settler-colonial situations. Yet as recent scholarship indicates, the specificity of settler colonialism is obscured if it is presumed to have been explained by general theories of 'colonialism'.[3] All such theories must be revisited to ask if they erroneously generalise specific colonial situations, and to provincialise all such situations by positioning them comparatively.

Scholars in colonial and postcolonial studies long have observed that colonial rule comes into being by mobilising gendered and sexual power. Yet this observation in itself does not denaturalise gender or sexuality, as is apparent when even major texts in these fields leave the impression that a natural gendered or sexual order underlies what colonial violence produced.[4] Anticolonial feminist and queer accounts show that colonisation's sexual and gendered methods are inventive, not foreordained; and that liberation will follow disturbing all that colonisation taught, so that distinctive ways of life might be recalled or imagined. Such accounts position 'gender' and 'sexuality' alongside 'race' and 'nation' as analytical categories that are freed from any universal referent, in that they designate power-laden arenas of contested knowledge and embodied practice that call for critical and creative engagement.

While such insights appear diversely without cohering in any single body of work, they were made possible by the signal contributions of critics within feminist antiracist and anticolonial movements. Indigenous, Black, US/Third World, and women of

colour feminisms synergised with feminists engaged in anticolonial and postcolonial nationalism to displace white settler and Western feminist thought: a history that at the end of the 20th century produced postcolonial and transnational feminisms as arenas where scholars across the global north and south could form alliances in critiquing colonial, racial, gendered, and sexual power.[5] The scholarly projects of queer of colour and queer diasporic critique formed in relation to these lineages, as have transnational queer studies that trouble racial or diasporic identity to address the global and imperial scales of sexual power.[6] Denaturalising gender, sexuality, race, and nation is a hallmark of such work, as when Chandra Mohanty's review of writings from the 1980s argued for 'the inherently *political* definition of the term *women of color*' as designating 'a political constituency, not a biological or even sociological one' that coheres around 'a *common context of struggle*'.[7] Jacqui Alexander joined Chandra Mohanty in emphasising their commitments to decolonisation, arguing that if 'decolonization involves thinking oneself out of the spaces of domination', then this will transpire only 'through praxis', which they sought by holding their work responsible to 'the concrete analyses of collective and organizational practice within feminist communities that offer provisional strategies for dismantling the psychic and social constellations put in place by colonization'.[8]

Explicit admissions such as these of the politics of academic knowledge conditioned the late 20th century moment when accounts of race, gender, and sexuality expanded in the study of colonialism. Historians analysed cases of gender and sexuality structuring colonial regimes.[9] Especially productive work emerged when scholars reinterpreted the colonial conditions of postcolonial nationalisms.[10] Complementary projects examined gender and sexuality within imperialism, as in accounts of white women's roles in colonial regimes.[11] Signal theorists presented comparative frameworks for understanding colonialism and its relation to modernity.[12] At times, accounts of the colonised locations of non-indigenous racialised people within settler states resonated with colonial studies, as in the case of Black history in the United States.[13] Scholars of the colonisation of indigenous people in what were, or in what would become settler states marked this context for discussion; but a general pull to integrate theories of colonialism encouraged

correlating these with other colonial situations.[14] Much of this literature did not present itself as responsible to social movements; but I emphasise that it emerged in a moment already troubled by antiracist, postcolonial, and transnational feminist and queer critiques to suggest that this literature's appearance may be interpreted in relation to the activist impetus and effect such concurrent critiques.

An especially productive theoretical direction in colonial studies of gender and sexuality proceeded from Ann Stoler's accounts of the 'intimacies of empire'. In some synergy with Mary Louise Pratt's reading of colonial situations as 'contact zones', Stoler invested her historical work with an ethnographic attention to colonialism's production within localised, relational situations defined by the power of gender, sexuality, race, class, and nation.[15] Intertwining accounts of global political economy with studies of embodiment and desire, Stoler grounded accounts of broad social processes and simultaneously insisted that localised research engage global scales. Stoler thus wrote against misreading her emphasis on gender and sexuality as 'intimate' complements to empire or capital, whereby the latter conversely (and erroneously) appear 'non-intimate' until the former are discussed. For if gender or sexuality ever seem aligned with the intimate, this is not 'natural' to them but accrues as if they constitute a nature through and against which politics and economics take shape. Moreover, in a colonial world, *race* exemplifies the consignment of structural relations to myths of embodied nature; and accounts of racialised sexuality and gender, including Stoler's, decidedly demonstrate that power relations are at once eminently institutional and immediately embodied.

The broad array of scholars examining 'intimacies of empire' demonstrates this model's productivity for colonial studies, as do ongoing adaptations of Stoler's work within indigenous studies.[16] My concern, however, regards the degree to which the model does or does not yet account for settler colonialism. Stoler's work was premised on her key case of the Dutch East Indies, a colony defined by plantation agriculture and the extraction of resources for global trade. In that context, Stoler foregrounded relations in the homes of officials and in everyday social life; notably, as labour, governance,

concubinage, and marriage forged ties among coloniser and colonised while defining 'mixed-caste' constituencies as significant to colonial society. Many similar qualities have obtained in settler societies. But citations of Stoler have tended to extrapolate from conditions that Patrick Wolfe has called 'franchise colonialism' without asking if settler societies function at all distinctly.[17] This returns us to a broader set of questions regarding the conflation of various modes of rule within theories of colonialism. Do conditions specific to colonial franchise ground theories of 'colonialism' as such? If this occurs, is settler colonialism excluded from study; is it ever included, but only as a manifestation of some deeper principle; and, in either case, what inaccuracies enter social theory? Conversely, has a conflation of franchise and settler colonialisms ever positioned a settler society as a model of colonialism, as such? In that case, were settler-colonial power relations misrepresented, or extrapolated into a general theory without acknowledging their distinct origin? Among many more, such questions must be addressed if colonial and postcolonial studies are to fully engage the implications of theory in the emergent field of settler colonial studies. I contend, and explain below, that a methodological attention to specificity in the literature on 'intimacies of empire' may assist us in clarifying how franchise and settler colonialisms are both distinct and relational. Yet regardless of the routes we take, scholars of settler colonialism – and this collection, by centreing gender and sexuality – request a hermeneutic that will specify settler-colonial power and show how its operation distinctly structures social life.

Among extant theories of settler colonialism, this essay and collection foreground those that felicitously re-evaluate scholarship in colonial studies to illuminate settler rule at work. Patrick Wolfe's argument that settler colonialism is premised on a 'logic of elimination' foregrounds the genocidal erasure of indigenous peoples as a governmental basis for their replacement by settlers.[18] He clarifies that the necessity of indigenous elimination to settler colonial rule differentiates this mode of power from a colonial franchise, which governs by preserving a subject people for racialised labour exploitation. He also notes that settler colonialism's genocidal effects result not only, or even in all instances from mass death, but also from governmental methods that recast indigenous peoples as subject to, or amalgamated within the body of a settler nation.[19]

Elimination thus can be understood to follow any effort to erase indigenous nationality as a status that can interrupt the preeminent or sole nationality asserted by settlers. Indeed, as Glen Coulthard has argued, settler polities may grant indigenous nations 'recognition' precisely to contain them as a domesticated difference that facilitates state authority over land and the definition of indigenous identity.[20]

The distinction of a settler polity is foregrounded by the process Lorenzo Veracini examines as the indigenisation of settlers, which he says 'is driven by the crucial need to transform an historical tie ("we came here") into a natural one ("the land made us")'.[21] Framing settler colonialism around the necessary principle of 'transfer' – both the transfer of indigenous peoples out of the settler polity, through removal and elimination, and the in-transfer of settlers – Veracini argues that this places settler colonialism 'in dialectical tension' with projects he calls 'colonialism'.[22] Given that (in Wolfe's terms, 'settlers come to stay; invasion is a structure, not an event'), we see here that a settler polity forms as an agent for settling invaders, their political and economic governance, and their metaphysics, so that all may be thought to originate from the lands where they arrived by force.[23] Philip Deloria explains this as an effect of European settler-colonists facing metropolitan perceptions of them as uncivilised, which they may address by impersonating indigenous difference to resist imperial rule, only to replace it by ruling in the name of civilisation on lands to which they now belong.[24] Yet as Veracini's work indicates, beyond the adoption of imaginaries of indigenous people, settler indigenisation invokes any process that makes settlers and their polity appear to be proper to the land: a process I also explain as the naturalisation of settler colonialism. Stories that narrate settlers or their state as naturally belonging to settled lands also governmentally *naturalise* invaders in a place that their own tales admit was not originally theirs. In narratives of legal or cultural naturalisation, settlers record their own illegitimacy and efforts to resolve it: by asserting a civilised nature marked by race, gender, or sexuality that defines their own national character or universality.[25]

This collection immediately calls settler colonial studies to investigate how indigenous elimination and settler indigenisation

transpire through explicitly gendered and sexual processes. I submit that the evidence on this point is in: they do, as our contributors illustrate. Moreover, a re-evaluation of literature on gender and sexuality in colonial studies elicits broad evidence of distinctly settler-colonial power relations, which synergises with extant theory in indigenous studies. Indeed, gendered and sexual power relations appear to be so intrinsic to procedures of indigenous elimination and settler indigenisation that these processes will not be fully understood until sexuality and gender are centred in their analysis.

Indigenous elimination manifestly proceeds through settler regulation of sexual relations, gender identity, marriage, reproduction, and genealogy, and all similar means for restricting resistant indigenous national difference. Governmental procedures in settler law demonstrate this, as when Canada's Indian Act in 1876 established gendered exclusions to 'Indian status'. The Act's ascription of status always correlated with a capacity to remove status. Alongside emancipation – status removal through conferral of citizenship – the Act imposed a form of patrilineal inheritance that denied status to indigenous women with status and their children if they married or bore children with a person without status.[26] Bonita Lawrence explains that as settlements expanded and the state divided nations into bands on isolated reserves, women and their families who lost status – and with it, access to reserve land or community – became progenitors of mixed-blood urban constituencies and countless descendants with no recognition of their indigenous heritage. Lawrence calls this effect of the Act 'statistical genocide': with over 25,000 women having lost status between 1876 and 1985, anywhere from one to two million of their descendants are now incapable of asserting any legally-recognised indigenous identity in Canada.[27] Yet the eliminatory logic of settler governance manifests here, as inventing and recognising 'Indian status' precisely created a basis for erasing indigeneity within the horizon of settler society.

Just as the Indian Act's sexual and gendered modes of elimination defined and regulated a racial status ('Indian'), tracing ascriptions of 'race' to indigenous people will reveal the gendered and sexualised methods of settler colonialism that presume or seek indigenous elimination. For instance, Australian policies of

assimilation targeted mixed-blood children for adoption into white families, work roles, and marriages, as key to larger efforts to amalgamate indigenous racial difference into whiteness.[28] Whereas in the United States, where the color line's logic of hypodescent defined blackness as racially impurifying, nations such as the Lumbee and the New England tribes that embraced African American familial ties and descent were policed as mixed-race constituencies and faced obstruction in their efforts to gain recognition as indigenous nations.[29] Indeed, assigning the racial logic of 'blood quantum' to define indigenous membership specifically produces laws that regulate affinal and familial life. For as J. Kehaulani Kauanui demonstrates, racialising kinship contradicts traditional definitions of indigenous nationhood based on *genealogy*, which may include adoption as well as biological descent, and without making 'race' a determinant of degree of relationship.[30] These processes illuminate Israel's Citizenship Law, which bars residency or citizenship to Palestinians from the occupied territories who become spouses to Israeli citizens (Palestinian or otherwise), thereby attempting to police state borders and Palestinian ties through marriage. For this law conforms to more constitutive settler-colonial efforts to produce Israel as a racial state by denying Palestinians the right of return: a denial that reclassifies refugee descendants as subjects of foreign governments, thereby pre-empting land claims that would be defensible by invoking the integrity of Palestinian familial ties and descent.

Settler governance racialises gender and sexuality among indigenous peoples by applying law within intimately institutional settings, as demonstrated by extant scholarship on colonial history. Settler projects of elimination have used methods of containment, such as reservations and reserves, to deny indigenous peoples a land base and to create settings for forced re-education. This was exemplified by the residential and boarding schools in Canada, the United States, and Australia, which, as demonstrated by Margaret Jacobs, Tsianina Lomawaima, and Celia Haig-Brown (among others), were focused on transforming bodies, desires, and relations to eliminate indigenous national identity and achieve assimilation.[31] Bonita Lawrence, Kim Anderson, and other indigenous scholars document how the gender violence and sexual abuse that defined institutional life for indigenous children produced trauma that can be

inherited by descendants while specifically affecting gender and sexual identity and familial relations.[32] In recognition of this, community-based efforts to address legacies of residential/boarding school trauma in North America often focus on renewing traditional knowledge and governance of gender and sexuality, which may include unlearning heteropatriarchy, empowering women, or reclaiming Two-Spirit histories as first steps towards the decolonial resurgence of indigenous nations.[33]

All such cases of settler efforts towards indigenous elimination also demonstrate the gendered and sexualised indigenisation of settlers. As argued by scholars of imperial intimacies, such as Jacobs or Cathleen Cahill, settler participants in residential/boarding schools, US Indian agencies, religious education, and other sites of settler governance gained gender and sexual identities through asserting control over indigenous people.[34] Cahill notably explains how U.S. Indian agents became 'federal fathers and mothers', who compelled accommodation from indigenous people by positioning them as subordinate kin, while simultaneously investing in gendered and familial identities to enact colonial governance and its violence.[35] Cahill's work interrupts any effort to read settler colonialism and gender/sexuality separately, for here we find them to be profoundly co-constitutive. In turn, studies such as these that address institutional intimacies in fact demonstrate a broader quality of settler colonialism: that settlers are intrinsically *relational* subjects, defined by a perpetual process of indigenous replacement. One place where settler indigenisation will become evident, then, will be in spaces where settlers arise as managers of indigenous people; both in their presence, and in their putative disappearance.

A major theme in recent works on gender, sexuality, and settler colonialism has been the construction of indigenised settlers in relation to indigenous gender/sexual difference. Mark Rifkin's rendering of indigenous-settler conflict in the nineteenth century US demonstrates that settler sexual modernity arose as a method to contravene indigenous sovereignty, even as settlers achieved their own landed modernity by positing its relationship to the difference of indigenous kinship.[36] My own work explains how imagining ties to indigenous authenticity has produced queer non-natives as settlers, whose 'liberation' by achieving citizenship and belonging to stolen

land comes at the expense of alliance with the decolonial aspirations of Two-Spirit/LGBTQ indigenous people and their nations.[37] Such routes to belonging to land and the state – as settlers claim, and transcend ties to indigeneity – are common to settler subjects, as Philip Deloria and Renee Bergland have demonstrated in the recurrence of 'Indians' as history or memory among US settler subjects. Yet, as they argue, correlations of indigenous people to settlers represent only a step towards settlers' indigenisation, which is to say, their seemingly inherent belonging to settled land, and that land's capacity to represent them and their way of life.[38] Extant scholarship suggests that routes to settler indigenisation will be explicitly gendered and sexualised.

Given that indigenisation establishes settler epistemology as a social norm, a ready example of this process is the European establishment of Western heteropatriarchal and binary sex/gender systems in settler societies, as a condition of their religious, economic, and political life. Any naturalisation of Western heteropatriarchy or binary sex/gender also naturalises settler colonialism. This statement may seem readily defensible within a settler society; but I intend it to reach more broadly. Settler colonisation performs the West's potential universality, by transporting and indigenising Western governance upon territories far from Europe: in settler states that then may appear not to be perpetual colonisers, but rather to be natural sites of Western law.[39] Under these conditions, the indigenisation of settlers and the universalisation of the West are one. Yet Western law also is universalised whenever settler societies come to be structured by a heteropatriarchal binary sex/gender system. That colonial system (which presumes racial distinctions of primitive from civilised gender/sexuality) becomes proper not just to settlers, much less to the indigenous nations they occupy, but to the whole world. For to indigenise Western heteropatriarchy and binary sex/gender on new lands is to prove their own premise that the totality of human life can conform to them. In this sense, to promise that Western logics of gender and sexuality are universal is to enact the logic of *settler* colonisation: and not only when addressing occupied peoples in settler states, but also whenever the potential indigenisation of such logics anywhere on earth implies their capacity to universally describe human nature.

We know that settlers indigenise when they imagine that their replacement of indigenous peoples is ordained by the progressive expansion of universal principles. Jean O'Brien recounts how New England settlers perceived indigenous disappearance amid their religiously-validated efforts to improve the land for civilisation – a reading that also might illuminate Zionist legitimations of Jewish settlement as bringing life to the desert.[40] We also know that whereas settler indigenisation appears to supplant indigenous presence, this will proceed in multiple ways. In the Anglophone settler states, qualities of indigeneity are absorbed to represent the settler nation, as in the case of place names (Kanata → Canada) or, as Allaine Cerwonka illustrates for Australia, the protection of indigenous ecosystems as settler patrimony.[41] Yet in Israel, as Meron Benvenisti recounts, state efforts to assert Jewish indigeneity assiduously erase evidence of Palestinian histories simultaneous or prior to the Jewish narratives inscribed on the land.[42]

The gendered and sexual indigenisation of settlers performs all these registers, as it presumes the replacement of a primitive culture by modernity, even as it obliterates or appropriates indigenous gender/sexual difference to defend its primacy on settled land. Deborah Miranda and I have argued that in the Americas, the targeting of persons who today might be called Two-Spirit for violent elimination instantiated colonial heteropatriarchy and a sex/gender binary as a *precursor* to establishing a new economic and legal system, while acting to educate the indigenous peoples who remained in the structural relations they and colonists now would enter.[43] This historical account was initiated by Two-Spirit activists, who for generations have critiqued the false universalisation and legal/scientific legitimation of Western systems of gender and sexuality as *settler* colonial. Two-Spirit people simultaneously present their revitalisation of tradition as a basis for principled leadership in indigenous national liberation struggle. In light of their work, critics would do well to interrogate the formative role of heteropatriarchy and a sex/gender binary within past and present formations of European settler colonialism.

This introduction has argued that forthright analysis of gender and sexuality will clarify and deepen theory of settler colonialism. Yet it also suggested a more profound claim: that gendered and sexual

power condition, or even generate the power relations we call 'settler colonialism'. While my brief essay emphasised the former claim, I allowed it to veer towards the latter – a claim that, once made, merits more discussion – to speak against a function that feminist and queer projects typically provide to academic fields, and one that we hope this collection will obviate for settler colonial studies. All-too-often, feminist and queer accounts get marshalled within fields that self-define as accounts of 'the social real', but that at some point decide to augment this by interpreting gender or sexuality: whether as something previously thought to be 'natural' and thus opaque to analysis, or thought to be 'cultural' and thus of lesser import than some primary economic, legal, or ontological concern. We who contribute to settler colonial studies have the chance to build an intellectual space that does not present gender or sexuality as secondary or additive to some deeper, and presumably separate principle. We must agree that gender and sexuality already inform every quality raised by the discussion of settler colonialism, making it incumbent upon scholars in this field to consider how and in what way this is so. The promise in making such a shift is that our theory will illuminate our object in its depth, in ways that would not have been possible and would have remained unknown until we dared to begin this work.

OUR CONTRIBUTIONS

The special issue opens with Brendan Hokowhitu's 'Producing Elite Indigenous Masculinities'. This essay interrogates the construction of male leadership as 'tradition' within forms of Maori governance managed by the settler state. Hokowhitu's critique of state investments in indigenous governance more deeply re-evaluates the modern governance of indigenous subjectivity. We find that a restrictive notion of Maori manhood has been promulgated as 'tradition' at the expense of other genealogies of collective leadership: notably the urban, often working-class Maori women and men whose roles in Maori revitalisation disappear when the state affirms heteropatriarchy to constitute a domesticated form of indigenous governance. In synergy with Coulthard, Hokowhitu demonstrates that indigenous elimination may proceed from the very

demand by the state that Maori be Maori, while the inculcation of colonial heteropatriarchy as 'indigenous' subjectivity also effectively pre-empts assertions of national difference that could trouble settler rule.

Nada Elia then illuminates the sexualisation of settler governance in 'Gay Rights With a Side of Apartheid', which examines the 'pinkwashing' of Israel's occupation of Palestine. Elia explains that this category of Palestinian queer critique reframes the Israeli defence of gay rights in international relations as investing in Western sexual modernity to obscure settler colonial violence against Palestinians – and to erase the existence of queer Palestinians. In turn, we learn that pinkwashing as a civilising discourse indigenises Israel as an extension of the West in the Middle East – a settler-colonial tactic that Elia suggests is inspired by the US claiming to defend the West through its perpetual occupation of indigenous nations. Elia thus joins Palestinian queer activists in centreing sexual politics as grounds for Palestinian national struggle, while the critical apparatus of pinkwashing positions Palestinian queers as leaders in that fight.

The gendered structuring of settler rule and the need for a creative activist response are examined further by Andrea Smith in 'The Moral Limits of the Law: Settler Colonialism and the Anti-Violence Movement'. Smith plies a tension among anti-violence activists who confront the US state as the very condition and agent of colonial and racial violence: participation with it seems anathema, yet the necessity to meet immediate needs impels some engagement. For activists in a settler colonial situation, Smith argues, dispelling belief in the morality of law can reposition law as a field of power to be strategically directed in accord with deeper political commitments. Smith cites cases in recent indigenous women's anti-violence activism and indigenous resistance to settler incursions on traditional lands, which shift from appealing to the morality of the state to making the indigenous targets of settler rule ungovernable by its moral force.

The issue continues with two essays that attend to cases of indigenous narrative resistance to settler rule that articulate tribally-specific and transnational registers. Mishuana Goeman's 'The Tools of a Cartographic Poet: Unmapping Settler Colonialism in Joy Harjo's

Poetry' reads Harjo as one among many contemporary indigenous women writers who compose 'narrative maps' for journeys to personal and collective decolonisation. Situating Harjo within the landed legacies of Creek survival and within the border-crossing travels of diasporic indigenous people, Goeman frames Harjo's poems to her granddaughter as traversing gendered spaces – of land, home, kin, nation, and settler colonisation – to envision indigenous resurgence beyond the power of settler conquest.

Renya Ramirez then interprets possibilities for resistance within the intimate dynamics of settler rule in 'Henry Roe Cloud to Henry Cloud: Ho-Chunk Strategies and Colonialism'. Countering recent writing about Cloud as a model of historical assimilation, Ramirez reinterprets the colonial traps laid for Cloud's participation in early twentieth century US society by illustrating the targeting of indigenous manhood for elimination via reformation as a hallmark of settler rule. Ramirez's archive also portrays the invention of settler identity as educative and amalgamating, in the gendered and quasi-familial intimacies of Cloud's patronage by Mary Roe. By asking how Cloud amid these pressures could have retained a discrepant Ho-Chunk identity, Ramirez announces her intention to propose modes of travel within settler societies that will sustain indigenous resistance. These two essays are complemented with a poem contributed by Qwo-Li Driskill, 'Measuring the Distance between Seattle and Texas', wherein the narrator affectively traverses the bordered landscapes of settler states in a creative imagining of relationship on decolonial terms.

The concluding essays explicitly compare the situations of indigenous nations in Canada to Palestine as a basis for generating new insight into the terms of settler rule as well as possibilities for allied struggles against settler colonialism. In '"From Jerusalem to the Grand River, Our Struggles are One": Challenging Canadian and Israeli Settler Colonialism', Mike Krebs and Dana Olwan dispel settler efforts to align indigenous peoples in Canada with supporting the state of Israel by tracing how alliances have formed, and can form among indigenous peoples in Canada and Palestinians. By comparing settler rule in Canada and Israel, and by explaining why alliances in Canada linked Palestinians to indigenous activists, Krebs

and Olwan provide crucial bases for understanding and deliberating the future of activist solidarity.

My essay, 'Queer Settler Colonialism in Canada and Israel: Articulating Two-Spirit and Palestinian Queer Critiques' then asks what insights we gain into settler rule or possibilities for anticolonial alliance by intersecting activist critiques by queer Palestinians and by Two-Spirit people in North America. The essay maps how these critiques call settlers, and notably queer settlers to challenge their complicity in conquest, in this time when Israeli pinkwashing and Canadian and US homonationalisms make sexual politics central to entrenching and extending the rule of settler states. The essay then engages insights into these processes in North America to illuminate queer settler colonialism in Israel, so as to illustrate the anticolonial knowledge and activism that may follow once settler situations are read comparatively and relationally. The essay thus responds to both critiques' aspirations for national liberation, as depicted in the accompanying image by Hulleah J. Tsinhnahjinnie, which portrays We'wha, 'the beloved', honoured *lhamana* and representative of the Zuni nation in 1886 to US President Grover Cleveland.[44] Among the many resonances of this image – created for the 20th anniversary International Two-Spirit Gathering (2008) – I note the synergy of its vision of national resurgence with the aspirations of Palestinian queer activists who speak in the name of their people's freedom. The collection thus ends by suggesting lines of solidarity among movements and their allies that may concertedly challenge heteropatriarchal and settler-colonial power. Michelle Erai closes by taking up the call of the issue in 'Responding' and indicating ways forward from the journey these essays have taken.

I conclude on the theme of alliance because both the content and implications of the essays model this for settler colonial studies. The field's intellectual and political work can be inspired by, and made accountable to the theories-from-practice of indigenous peoples who are challenging settlement and its naturalisation. This special issue, by appearing early in the publication of *settler colonial studies*, also reflects the relative newness of 'settler colonialism' as an analytical category with a corresponding body of theory. In light of this, the array of contributions in this issue indicates that the intellectual content that will be important to this field will not all

claim – nor need to claim – a place 'inside' it. As Linda Tuhiwai Smith has argued, indigenous scholars who reject imperial methods of knowledge production may trace their intellectual genealogies along distinctive 'dissent lines', which will be grounded in collective practices of cultural memory and liberation struggle as well as in various modes of academic writing.[45] All of these trajectories of knowledge will articulate settler colonial studies without being subsumed within that field. Alliance suggests one model for forming responsible relationships among distinct, yet potentially linked intellectual histories. Specifically, settler colonial studies can take up a responsibly allied relationship to critical scholarship in all fields (indigenous studies, Palestinian studies) that centre the knowledges of peoples resisting settler colonialism, and in this way gain its impetus as a relevant response to landed struggles for decolonisation.

BIOGRAPHICAL NOTE

Scott L. Morgensen is the author of Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization *(University of Minnesota Press, 2011) and co-editor of* Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics and Literature *(University of Arizona Press, 2011). He is an Associate Professor in the Department of Gender Studies at Queen's University.*

NOTES

[1] See, for example: Kim Anderson, *A Recognition of Being: Reconstructing Native Womanhood* (Toronto: Second Story Press, 2000); Qwo-Li Driskill, Chris Finley, Brian Joseph Gilley, Scott Lauria Morgensen, 'Introduction', *Queer Indigenous Studies: Critical Interventions in Theory, Politics, and Literature* (Tucson, AR: University of Arizona Press, 2011); Deborah Miranda, 'Extermination of the Joyas: Gendercide in Spanish California', *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 16,1-2 (2010): 253-284; Andrea Smith, *Conquest: Sexual Violence and American Indian Genocide* (Cambridge: South End Press, 2005).

[2] See, for example: Anderson, *A Recognition of Being*; Brian Joseph Gilley, *Becoming Two-Spirit: Gay Identity and Social Acceptance in Indian Country* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2006); Clive Aspin, 'Exploring Takatapui Identity within the Maori Community: Implications for Health and Well-Being', in Driskill, Finley, Gilley, Morgensen, *Queer Indigenous Studies*.

[3] Lorenzo Veracini, *Settler Colonialism: A Theoretical Overview* (Houndsimlls: Palgrave MacMillan, 2010); Veracini, Lorenzo, 'Introducing Settler Colonial Studies', *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1, 1 (2011): 1-12.

[4] For instance, critics observed that accounts of sexualised feminisation in Orientalism by Edward Said or Malek Alloula did not necessarily trouble the existence or function of a gendered order that produced sexualised violence or silenced women's voices. Whereas similar critiques were directed at Fanon's

writing on gender, antiracist and anticolonial feminist critics argued that his work was more immediately available to their mobilisation. See, for example: Gregory K. Betts, 'Wanted Women, Woman's Wants: *The Colonial Harem* and Post-Colonial Discourse', *Canadian Review of Contemporary Literature*, September (1995): 527-550; Madhu Dubey, 'The True Lie of the Nation: Fanon and Feminism', *Differences*, 10, 2 (1998): 1-29; Reina Lewis (ed.), *Gender Orientalism: Race, Femininity, Representation* (New York: Routledge, 1996); Sara Mills, *Discourses of Difference: An Analysis of Women's Travel Writing and Colonialism* (New York: Routledge, 1997); T. Denean Sharpley-Whiting, *Frantz Fanon: Conflicts and Feminisms* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield, 1998).

[5] Gloria Anzaldúa (ed.), *Making Face, Making Soul Haciendo Caras: Creative and Critical Perspectives by Feminists of Color* (San Francisco: Aunt Lute Books, 1990); Inderpal Grewal, Caren Kaplan (ed.), *Scattered Hegemonies: Postmodernity and Transnational Feminist Practices* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1994); Chandra Mohanty, Ann Russo, Lourdes Torres (eds.), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1991); Richa Nagar, Amanda Locke Swarr (eds.), *Critical Transnational Feminist Praxis* (Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, 2010); Trinh T. Minh-ha, *Woman, Native, Other* (Bloomington, IN: University of Indiana Press, 1988).

[6] Roderick Ferguson, *Aberrations in Black: Towards a Queer of Color Critique* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004); Gayatri Gopinath, *Impossible Desires: Queer Diasporas and South Asian Public Cultures* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005); Jasbir Puar, *Terrorist Assemblages: Homonationalism in Queer Times* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007); Chandan Reddy, *Freedom with Violence: Race, Sexuality, and the U.S. State* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2011).

[7] Italics in original. Chandra Mohanty, 'Cartographies of Struggle: Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism', in C. Mohanty et al (eds), *Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism* (Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press, 1991), 7.

[8] M. Jacqui Alexander, Chandra Mohanty, 'Introduction: Genealogies, Legacies, Movements', in M. Jacqui Alexander, Chandra Mohanty (eds), *Feminist Genealogies, Colonial Legacies, Democratic Futures* (New York: Routledge, 1997), xxviii.

[9] See, for example: Philippa Levine, *Prostitution, Race, and Politics: Policing Venereal Disease in the British Empire* (New York: Routledge, 2003); Anne McClintock, *Imperial Leather: Race, Gender and Sexuality in the Colonial Contest* (New York: Routledge, 1995); Eileen Suarez, *Imposing Decency: The Politics of Sexuality and Race in Puerto Rico, 1870-1920* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999).

[10] See, for example (in context of the British Raj and postcolonial India): Partha Chatterjee, *The Nation and Its Fragments* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1993); Kumkum Sangari, Sudesh Vaid (eds), *Recasting Women: Essays in Indian Colonial History* (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1990); Gayatri Spivak, *The Postcolonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues* (New York: Routledge, 1990).

[11] See, for example: Billie Melman, *Women's Orients: English Women and the Middle East, 1718-1918* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1985); Vron Ware, *Beyond the Pale: White Women, Racism, and History* (London: Verso, 1992).

[12] Antoinette Burton (ed.), *Gender, Sexuality, and Colonial Modernities* (New York: Routledge, 1999); Mary Louise Pratt, *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation* (New York: Routledge, 1992).

[13] See, for example: Saidya Hartman, *Scenes of Subjection: Terror, Slavery, and Self-Making in Nineteenth-Century America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1997).

[14] This quality is apparent in Pratt, *Imperial Eyes*, and McClintock, *Imperial Leather*.

[15] Ann Laura Stoler, *Carnal Knowledge and Imperial Power: Race and the Intimate in Colonial Rule* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002); Ann Laura Stoler, *Race and the Education of Desire: Foucault's History of Sexuality and the Colonial Order*

of Things (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1995); Frederick Cooper, Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Tensions of Empire: Colonial Cultures in a Bourgeois World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1997).
[16] See, for example: Burton, *Gender, Sexuality, and Colonial Modernities*; Smith, *Conquest*; Ann Laura Stoler (ed.), *Haunted by Empire: Geographies of Intimacy in North American History* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006).
[17] Patrick Wolfe, 'Land, Labor and Difference: Elementary Structures of Race'. *American Historical Review*, 106 (2001): 866-905.
[18] Patrick Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native', *Journal of Genocide Research* 8, 4 (2006): 387-409.
[19] Patrick Wolfe, 'Structure and Event: Settler Colonialism and the Question of Genocide', in A. Dirk Moses (ed.), *Empire, Colony, Genocide: Conquest, Occupation, and Subaltern Resistance in World History* (Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2008).
[20] Glen Coulthard, 'Subjects of Empire: Indigenous Peoples and the "Politics of Recognition" in Canada', *Contemporary Political Theory*, 6 (2007): 437-460.
[21] Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*: 21-22.
[22] Veracini, *Settler Colonialism*: 33; 7.
[23] Wolfe, 'Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native': 388.
[24] Philip J. Deloria, *Playing Indian* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998).
[25] See, for example, David Kazanjian, *The Colonizing Trick: National Cultural and Imperial Citizenship in Early America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2003); Scott Lauria Morgensen, *Spaces between Us: Queer Settler Colonialism and Indigenous Decolonization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2011): 43-44.
[26] Martin Cannon, 'First Nations Citizenship: An Act to Amend the Indian Act (1985) and the Accommodation of Sex Discriminatory Policy', *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 56 (2006); Bonita Lawrence, *'Real' Indians and Others: Mixed-Blood Urban Native People and Indigenous Nationhood* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2004).
[27] Lawrence, *'Real' Indians and Others*.
[28] Warwick Anderson, *The Cultivation of Whiteness: Science, Health, and Racial Destiny in Australia* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2006); Katherine Ellinghaus, 'Biological Absorption and Genocide: A Comparison of Assimilation Policies in the United States and Australia', *Genocide Studies and Prevention*, 4, 1 (2009): 59-79.
[29] Amy den Ouden, *Beyond Conquest: Native Peoples and the Struggle for History in New England* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2005); Malinda Maynor Lowery, *Lumbee Indians in the Jim Crow South: Race, Identity, and the Making of a nation* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2010).
[30] J. Kehaulani Kauanui, *Hawaiian Blood: Colonialism and the Politics of Sovereignty and Indigeneity* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2008). See also: Tracey Deer, *Club Native* (National Film Board of Canada, 2008).
[31] Celia Haig-Brown, *Resistance and Renewal: Surviving the Indian Residential School* (Toronto: Arsenal Pulp Press, 1988); Margaret Jacobs, *White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880-1940* (Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press, 2009); K. Tsianina Lomawaima, *They Called it Prairie Light: The Story of Chilocco Indian School* (Lincoln, NC: University of Nebraska Press, 1995).
[32] Lawrence, *'Real Indians' and Others*; Anderson, *A Recognition of Being*.
[33] See, for example, the work of the Native Youth Sexual Health Network (Toronto). Available at: http://www.nativeyouthsexualhealth.com/ Accessed: 01/04/12. Additionally, Kim Anderson and Robert Innes are conducting research on community-based efforts to address indigenous masculinity in response to trauma: 'Indigenous Masculinities, Identities, and Achieving Biimaadiziwin', in coordination with the Ontario Native Friendship Centres Association. Available at: http://artsandscience.usask.ca/nativestudies/research/ Accessed: 01/04/12.

[34] Myra Rutherdale, Katie Pickles (ed.), *Contact Zones: Aboriginal and Settler Women in Canada's Colonial Past* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2005); Stoler, *Haunted by Empire*.
[35] Cathleen Cahill, *Federal Fathers and Mothers: A Social History of the United States Indian Service, 1869-1933* (Chapel Hill, NC: University of North Carolina Press, 2011).
[36] Mark Rifkin, *When Did Indians Become Straight? Kinship, The History of Sexuality, and Native Sovereignty* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011).
[37] Morgensen, *Spaces between Us*.
[38] Renée Bergland, *The National Uncanny: Indian Ghosts and American Subjects* (Hanover, NH: University Press of New England, 2000); Deloria, *Playing Indian*.
[39] See my further explanation of this process in: Scott Lauria Morgensen, 'The Biopolitics of Settler Colonialism: Right Here, Right Now', *Settler Colonial Studies*, 1, 1 (2011): 52-76.
[40] Jean M. O'Brien, *Firsting and Lasting: Writing Indians Out of Existence* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).
[41] Allaine Cerwonka, *Native to the Nation: Disciplining Landscapes and Bodies in Australia* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2004).
[42] Meron Benvenisti, *Sacred Lanscape: The Buried History of the Holy Land Since 1948* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002).
[43] Miranda, 'Extermination of the Joyas'; Morgensen, *Spaces between Us*.
[44] On the life and work of We'wha, see: Will Roscoe, *The Zuni Man-Woman* (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1991).
[45] Linda Tuhiwai Smith, *Decolonizing Methodologies: Research and Indigenous Peoples* (New York: Zed Books, 1999): 13.